CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

The Modern Churchman.

No. 5. AUGUST, 1916. Vol. VI.

IN MEMORIAM.

Edward Frederic Hoernlé.

That branch of the Anglican Communion known as the Episcopal Church of Scotland cannot be regarded as a Liberal body, nevertheless she has in her ministry many men who are not only being slowly dragged along by the Liberalising movement, but who are fully awake to the significance, and to the vital need, of that movement, and are centres of a really Liberal influence in their congregations, and in the Church at large. The foremost of these has been just taken from our midst, and we are all deeply mourning his loss. Edward Frederic Hoernlé was a man of wide culture, and of the broadest sympathies. He had filled the important Rectory of St. James', Leith, since 1898. In 1909 he was elected by the Clergy of the Diocesan Synod to a Canonry of St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh, an honour which his great gifts as a preacher, and his wide attainments as a scholar, well entitled him to receive. A few years later he was appointed Chancellor of the Diocese. But ecclesiastical preferment brought with it for him no narrowing of sympathy or loss of independence. Many of us will remember him chiefly for the deep and tender interest he took in the younger clergy, especially in the work of those among them who are alive to the intellectual and social needs of the age. His house and study were always open to those who wished to discuss seriously vital problems. He could listen patiently to crudities of thought, and he was ever ready with practical and

kindly counsel for those who found themselves confronted by the difficulties which are inevitable if the task of criticising and reconstructing traditional beliefs is to be well done.

Dr. Hoernlé was not until comparatively recently a member of the Churchmen's Union. He had a natural and widespread dislike of anything like party associations, but he attended the two Conferences at Ripon and Rugby. Many will remember him, and few can forget his earnest and suggestive contribution to the discussion of the Creed question last year. He had hoped to be able to attend the Conference at Oxford this month. Recently he had seen his way more clearly to definite association with the Union, and had been elected by the Council to the office of vice-president. For some years past his health had been failing. In the spring of the present year an operation became necessary. For awhile he seemed to be making steady, if slow, progress towards recovery. But a serious relapse occurred, and he passed away on Sunday, July 23rd, at the age of 64. We may say of him in the words of the poet he loved, and to the interpretation of whose work he made a valuable contribution, that he has gone forth to meet "adventures brave and new." But we are the poorer for his going.

Dr. Hoernlé was born in India. His father, Theophilus Hoernlé, was a missionary of the C.M.S. in Agra. His son received his early education in Switzerland, and was for a time a student at the University of Basle. He attended the lectures of Fr. Nietzsche and was keenly conscious of the charm of that remarkable man, though he had little sympathy with his ideals. He spoke and read German fluently, and always bore upon his intellectual life the marks of his early training. As a thinker he had much in common with the Ritschlians. He was wont to insist strongly on the distinction between judgments of fact and judgments of value, which plays such a conspicuous part in their theology; and he helped many of us to realise the the vital importance of this distinction.

The call of the mission field sounded early in his ears. He came to Edinburgh in the seventies, and studied medicine under

Lord Lister, among others, and took a medical degree. He was ordained in 1879, and sent out by the C.M.S. as a medical missionary to Ispahan. There he laboured for ten years. He never lost a keen interest in Persian affairs, and it was one of his chief grounds of pride that he was the first to introduce anti-septic surgery into that country. His experience as a missionary affected deeply his interpretation of Christianity. He was fond of insisting that the New Testament is a missionary book, and that it could only be understood in the light of what happened in the mission field. Perhaps, too, the years in Persia deepened that strong religious fervour, which was one of his outstanding characteristics. He had a passion for "saving souls," which is not always displayed by Liberal theologians.

In 1890 he returned to this country, I think for reasons of health. For awhile he acted as Assistant Superintendent of the Edinburgh Medical Missionary Association, and at the same time he served as curate to St. Peter's Church in the city. During this period he developed a keen interest in the affairs of the University. Large numbers of students attended the services at St. Peter's when he was preaching, and listened to his sermons with rapt attention. He was appointed a member of the General Council of the University and served on its Library Committee. He also often acted as examiner in German. His interest in education was always keen, and as years advanced his useful activities in this field grew ever more extensive. He became a member of the Leith School Board, and in that capacity did most valuable work.

At St. James', Leith, he made of the Church in which he ministered a really potent Christian influence. He served on a very large number of the Boards and Committees of the Episcopal Church, and exerted a steady influence in the direction of true Liberalism. We owe to his suggestion some of the best things in the Revised Prayer Book which has recently been produced. He had been nominated as one of the Representatives of the Scotch Episcopal Church in connection with the

World Conference on faith and order. His interest in the great cause of Christian unity was keen, and his view of the problems involved, sane and sympathetic.

We shall ever remember him as one in whom intense earnestness, Catholic sympathies,[1] and a fearless intellectual sincerity were finely blended, and as one whose personal character and piety were an inspiration in themselves.

Gulbane,
East Lothian.

J. LAWRENCE GARDNER.

CHURCH AND STATE AND THE ARCHBISHOPS' COMMITTEE.

By the EDITOR.

The Archbishops' Committee, consisting of twenty-six[2] prominent Churchmen appointed—

> "to inquire what changes are advisable in order to secure in the relations of Church and State a fuller expression of the spiritual independence of the Church as well as of the national recognition of religion,"—

has, after three years' deliberations, published its Report, a compact volume of 304 pages.[3]

All readers of the Report will be grateful to the Committee for the painstaking manner in which they have performed their difficult task. Students of English Church History, especially of its modern developments, will be particularly grateful for the admirable summaries and masterly analyses, mainly in the form of appendices, provided by individual members of the committee.

[1] A few weeks before his death he wrote to a friend :—

> "I had myself thought of writing a short defence of Lake to maintain that men like him ought to have their place in the Church, and that in the meanwhile we can wait till the many shall see what the few see already now. . . . My illness prevented even my doing this little."—ED. *M.C.*

[2] Including the Earl of Selborne (chairman), Sir William Anson (deceased), Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, Bishop Browne (late of Bristol), Lord Hugh Cecil, Sir Foster Cunliffe, Sir Lewis Dibden, Duke of Devonshire, Mr. Douglas Eyre, Dr. Frere, Dr. Gee, Mr. H. E. Kemp, Bishops of Liverpool and Oxford, Lord Parmoor, Rev. W. Temple, Mr. A. L. Smith, Mr. Mansbridge, Dr. Guy Warman, and Canon Masterman.

[3] Published by S.P.C.K. Price 2/6 net.

The Report begins by outlining the relations of Church and State in England. It deals next with the present system of Church Government, especially its defects. Next it enunciates the principle of Spiritual Independence. It then proposes a scheme of Church Legislative Reform, safeguarding on the one hand the interests of the State, and on the other hand indicating the methods by which this new legislative machinery could be established. After this follow memoranda by individual members who were unable to agree on all points with the Report of the Committee. The remainder of the volume is taken up with twelve appendices dealing with the constitutions of other churches of the Anglican communion, the relation of the Established Church of Scotland to the State, Lay Feeling of the working classes towards the Church, etc.

The tone of the Report is learned, judicious, optimistic, eminently conciliatory, and withal delightfully lucid. It contains some memorable *obiter dicta, e.g.*:—

"The past may be an incubus as well as an inspiration."

"The laity must be coaxed to swallow the self-government which will invigorate their spiritual life."

"To the best of the men and women in the colleges it appears that it is the business of the Church to take up questions just because they are burning questions."

"The opportunity the Church has to win the student class to-day fills me with enthusiasm, but my ardour is constantly damped as I think of what the Church offers them."

"Class-consciousness is a very real sentiment, and the workers will not be satisfied with any administration in which they have not a voice."

"The administrative classes are largely ignorant of the modern spirit and the aspirations of the workers, and they under-rate the ethical driving force of the revolutionary ideas."

"The amount of latent power capable of being called into action from bodies of men permanently united for an ideal object, is one of the most striking features of modern life."

"Materialism as a religion is not satisfactory to the ordinary man."

"Conscientious perversity of mind."

This volume might well be prescribed as a text book for candidates for Priests' Orders. Certainly all Churchmen interested in Church Reform should make an effort to find time to read it.

Whilst holding that the Church of England is paralysed in some directions because it has not power to adjust some parts of its organisation and machinery to new needs and conditions, the Committee wishes to dissociate itself altogether from the view that the Church's dependence upon Parliament has in the past been incompatible with a large measure of spiritual efficiency.

> "It would be wholly untrue to suggest that the connexion of the Church with the State is confining it in the channels of dead officialdom."

Yet the strain of the present relationship is severe, in some respects, almost intolerable. There is therefore urgent need for some alteration in that relationship. Parliament is neither able nor willing to legislate for the Church in many matters in which legislation is urgently needed. A plan is therefore proposed by which the Church, by means of a Church Council (formed on the model of the existing Representative Church Council, consisting of three Houses of Bishops, Clergy, and Laity), should be enabled to legislate for itself subject to the supervision and veto of Parliament. The method by which this is to be achieved is distinctly intricate, and many will feel that, while our ecclesiastical authorities are given great power under the scheme, there is a danger that Parliament, owing to the negative functions allotted to it, may not be sufficiently alert at all times to the need for keeping the National Church free, progressive, and comprehensive.

The most attractive part of the proposed scheme is the establishment in every parish of Parochial Church Councils with legal powers. It is proposed:—

(1) That these Councils should be empowered—

(*a*) to arrange in conjunction with the incumbent the Parochial Church budget, including the various church expenses, quotas, contributions, etc.;

(*b*) to arrange with the incumbent the number and allocation of the collections in church;

(*c*) to co-operate generally with the incumbent in the initiation and development of church work, both in the parish and outside;

(*d*) to keep the electoral roll.

(2) That they should be the normal channel of communication between the parishioners and the Bishop of the Diocese, and should have the right--

(*a*) to make representations to the Bishop as regards—
(i.) the suitability of any person presented to the Bishop to be instituted to the incumbency of the parish;
(ii.) alterations in services and ornaments;
(iii.) the affairs of the church, and cure of souls in the parish.
(*b*) To make complaint of, and to take proceedings against, an incumbent in the same manner as parishioners or inhabitants of a parish have, or may hereafter have, power.

(3) That they should have the right—
(*a*) to accept and to hold gifts of property;
(*b*) to levy a voluntary church rate.

(4) That they should take over and exercise all the ecclesiastical powers of the vestry; and also the powers, duties, and liabilities of the churchwardens, so far only as the matters referred to in 1 and 2 are concerned.

(5) That they should exercise such other powers and functions as may hereafter be conferred on them.

This is truly admirable, and will comfort the hearts of all Liberal Churchmen, and of many others. It is also recommended that the churchwardens, if otherwise qualified, should be *ex officio* members of the Council. There is some division of opinion as to the incumbent's relation to it. Here we agree with the memorandum of the Bishop of Oxford that under *normal* conditions the incumbent should be both a member and *ex officio* chairman, but that when business under heading 2 is to be transacted, only lay members under a lay vice-chairman should attend and transact business. There are, however, two unsatisfactory features in connection with the Parochial Church Councils scheme.

(1) The setting up of the Parochial Church Council is, if we do not miscalculate, the *seventh* step in the establishment of the scheme of self-government. We are most emphatically of opinion that it should be the *first step*. It is the very foundation stone of constitutional Church Reform, and should come first. If no other portion of the Archbishops' Committee's Report be realised in practical form, yet if this be, it will well repay the Committee for their arduous labours, for local church government in the parochial areas is the reform which is most ardently desired, and would prove most eminently beneficial. We believe that to promote a Bill simply to obtain this measure of church reform would command a large amount of Parliamentary

support, for it is a measure that would appeal to the heart of the nation, whether Church or Nonconformist. We would urge then, that it be placed *first*, not *seventh* in the *agenda*, and that if the rest of the Archbishops' Committee's scheme be rejected, at least that Churchmen will go forward with this measure, for it meets the most vital and pressing of needs.

(2) There is another unsatisfactory feature in the Parochial Church Council scheme.

> "The members of the Parochial Church Council must be actual lay communicants, above 21 years of age, and of either sex."

These conditions will meet with general approval; the unsatisfactory feature, however, concerns the qualifications of the electors of the Parochial Church Council.

> "*Qualified electors* in a parish must be above 21 years of age and may belong to either sex, provided that they either (1) are actual communicants, or (2) have been baptized and confirmed and are admissible to Holy Communion, and do not belong to any religious body which is not in communion with the Church of England. Their names are to be kept on an electoral roll; and anyone wishing to be placed on it must sign a declaration that he or she is qualified to be enrolled."

This seems to us much too narrow a basis. It means that for purposes of self-government the Church is limited to the communicants or the confirmed. When it is realised what a small proportion this is of the Churchpeople of the nation, and of the nation as a whole, it seems a serious mistake to restrict the Church franchise to them. This franchise is much narrower than exists in many other branches of the Anglican communion *e.g.*, the Churches of Ireland, West Indies, Australia, New Zealand, the Protestant Episcopal Church in U.S.A., etc., and although ideally right, the practical objections to it are serious. We should much prefer to see the New Zealand Church franchise adopted in this country. Bishop George Augustus Selwyn was not only a strong Churchman but also a great and far-sighted organizer. In the New Zealand Church the would-be parochial elector has to be an adult resident who has, at least two months before voting, signed (as a pre-requisite to being placed on the parish register) a declaration that he is a member of the Church of New Zealand, commonly called the Church of

England. What exactly constitutes Church membership is not defined. The parishioner decides that for himself. Should his parish priest learn after his registration that he is not confirmed and a communicant, he has now as the result of his signing the parish register an excellent opportunity of approaching his new parishioner and persuading him to share in those privileges of full Church membership which ought ideally to be united to his electoral rights. Many a man has signed the register first, and has been confirmed afterwards, who otherwise would never have been confirmed at all. The religious character of the Church assemblies is in no wise placed in jeopardy by this wider franchise; the character of those assemblies from the Church point of view is quite sufficiently safe-guarded by the restriction of their membership to actual communicants.

From every point of view we would plead with our Anglo-Catholic brethren in this matter, to adopt the wider policy of a great High Churchman of the past—a man whose courage was no less than his piety and zeal and wisdom. If the Committee's restricted Church franchise is adopted as the policy of the dominant Church party, it must, we fear, either block Church Reform or lead to Disestablishment. The declaration by the parochial elector that he does "not belong to any religious body which is not in communion with the Church of England," seems proper enough, but even here there is a closing of one of the doors which leads into a better and far-stretching future. To-day we look forward to re-union; why might it not be assisted by men and women belonging to several Christian communions at the same time? Why should they not? We knew a devout English clergyman, now dead, who had been a Wesleyan, but who, after his ordination, still continued to attend Wesleyan class-meetings. Much of the estrangement between Churchmen and Methodists would disappear if such a practice were encouraged by the Church authorities. Even if the Anglicanism of to-day condemns such action, the greater Anglicanism of to-morrow will approve it. Church Reformers in these days need to take, not only long but also very large

views. Not only does the heart make the Christian theologian, it also makes the ecclesiastical statesman.

There is in the Report much more with which we should like to deal. It is only possible to touch on two more points.

It is proposed to reform the Lower Houses of the Convocations by making them more truly representative of the priesthood. With this policy we have every sympathy, especially when it includes the unbeneficed clergy. We fail, however, to see why archdeacons should continue to sit *ex officio*, and deans be deprived of that privilege. The deans are really more truly representative of the priesthood than the archdeacons, who are *oculi episcopi*. Moreover, the deans represent what the archdeacons, as a body, do not represent, and that is sound learning. With the falling standard of episcopal erudition and the rising value set on practical organization and financial ability, there is much to be said for the retention of deans as *ex officio* members of the Lower Houses, on the ground that, as a body, they are erudite, and for that reason are increasingly unlikely to sit in Convocation except *ex officio*.

The other point to which we wish to refer is the representation of the laity in Church Assemblies. Except in the case of election to the Parochial Church Councils, and possibly to the Ruri-decanal Conferences, lay representatives are selected by indirect election or secondary election. The Parochial Church Meeting elects lay representatives to the Ruri-decanal Conference; the Ruri-decanal lay representatives elect the lay representatives to the Diocesan Conference or Synod; the lay representatives of the Diocesan Synod elect the lay representatives to the House of Laymen of the Church Council. This is, indeed, as a writer in the *Guardian* calls it, "the steep ascent."

The reason for adopting this method of lay election is that the expense and organization needful for the direct method render it impracticable. The objection, however, to the indirect method is that the lay element becomes more ecclesiastical with each stage in its ascent, and so really ceases to be lay in that assembly where it is most needful that the lay voice should be

heard. Moreover, this system of indirect election enables an organized party within the Church, if it be in a slight majority, to secure all the representation for itself, or if it will not be so tyrannical as that, then to put in a few of the more harmless of its opponents for the sake of appearances.

Whilst we favour the territorial basis as the only basis for electing lay representatives to the Parochial Church Council, we believe that it would be best very largely to abandon the territorial basis in the higher lay elections. This appears to be the view of the Master of Balliol, Mr. Mansbridge, and Mr. Kemp when they seek to secure adequate lay representation for the working and student classes. We have every sympathy with their proposals, but we think that they do not go nearly far enough.

An entirely different system of lay representation ought to be originated. We would urge that lay representation be secured by means of lay electoral colleges. For instance, we believe excellent results could be obtained by constituting lay electoral colleges from the following bodies:—The Church Army, Workers' Educational Association, The Student Christian Movement, Parishioners' Churchwardens, Lay Readers' Association, Foreign Missionary Societies, Home Missionary Societies, Sunday School Teachers' Union, Church Lads' Brigade, Teachers in the Church Schools, Church of England Men's Society, Christian Social Union, O.U.C.U. at Oxford and the corresponding Society at Cambridge, and in the newer Universities, &c., &c. Each electoral college would have to decide how to elect its lay representatives, the Church authorities would simply constitute the college, settle its number of representatives, and insist that they must be actual communicant Churchmen. By this means, and by judicious co-option, a really vital, variegated, full-blooded lay representation might be obtained, instead of the sort of lay representation we have at present.

The publication of the Committee's Report is opportune, for it suggests that the Church authorities desire to combine Church Reform with the work of the National Mission. At the

same time, Churchmen ought to bear in mind that large measures of Church Reform can be accomplished without recourse to Parliament. This is the case, especially in all educational reform, *e.g.*, the training of candidates for Holy Orders, the higher education of the clergy, the improvement of religious instruction in our Church schools, the re-organization of Sunday schools, and in the relation of the Church to the working classes and social reform. The Church's relation to the State is no doubt susceptible of re-adjustment, but no student of Church Reform, particularly of liturgical reform at the present time, can feel that Parliament is altogether responsible for our shortcomings. The real reason why many excellent reforms are not accomplished is because the clergy as a body are not alive to the pressing need for them, but desire rather to secure ecclesiastical changes which the nation cannot be persuaded to regard as reforms.

"The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
But in ourselves, that we are underlings."

THE OUTFIT OF A MODERN CHURCHMAN.

By the Rev. W. A. Cunningham Craig, M.A., Vicar of St. Sepulchre's, Holborn Viaduct, E.C.

VIII.—His Outlook.

There is a question which ought to be exercising the minds of all religious teachers at the present time, and that is: What are the future prospects of religion? What part is organised religion going to play in the life of the world in the years that lie immediately before us? To what extent will Christianity survive the great crisis through which the world has been passing? How far will the religion of our children resemble, and how far will it differ from, that which we ourselves received?

The importance of that question is only just beginning to force itself upon us. The events which have been happening among us have shaken the world to its foundations. We all realise more or less acutely that in no single department can life be quite the same again. A whole age in the world's history is passing away and a new one is opening. We stand on one of the great watersheds of history. Religious faith and practice cannot remain unaffected by the changes that are imminent everywhere else. They must to some extent share in the revolution which is passing over the world. It is time that we addressed ourselves seriously to these problems. What is the outlook for religion, and especially for the Christian religion, at the present day? Every Churchman has got to face that question, and as it seems at present every Churchman is prepared to answer it in his own way. The outlook of the modern Churchman is therefore only one contribution to this subject.

Now if we study the utterances of many of our most prominent religious leaders and teachers, we shall be struck with the fact that each of them seems disposed to think that the result of the war will be the eventual triumph of that particular expression of Christianity with which he is personally identified. It is a disappointing fact that the only answer that they can give to the most urgent question that they have ever had to consider, is an answer framed in the old terms with which the world has been so long familiar. It is a distressing evidence of what we may call the short-sightedness of the professional religious classes that they seem quite unable to look outside the bounds of their own system, to express their thoughts in any other language than that of the well-worn formulae. They seem all but incapable of grasping the fact that religion itself is in the melting-pot, and that what may come out will be something entirely different from any of the systems which have existed before.

Just consider for a moment some of the advice which has been given to us. There are some who seem to think that all

that is wanted is that we should put new energy into the old methods. All that we have to do is to build again upon exactly the old lines. The old recipes are good enough, if we only apply them more vigorously than we have done in the past. We have only to do better what we have done before and all will be well. "The bricks are fallen, but we will build with hewn stone; the sycamores are cut down, but we will change them into cedars." There has been nothing wrong, nothing defective in our methods in the past, only in the thoroughness with which we have carried them out. That is, perhaps, the most disappointing answer that can be given, for it points to an inability to learn from experience, a refusal to face the plainest facts of the present situation. There are others who seem to imagine that the war will be followed by a return to the beliefs and practices of earlier and more credulous times, that there will be a revival among us of medieval cults and superstitions, that we shall be drawn nearer to those branches of the Christian Church which have been least affected by the changes of modern life. And there are not wanting signs that this represents a real danger. The war may be followed, as the Dean of Durham has pointed out, by a religious re-action. Men will grope back into the darkness because they are afraid of the light.

Again it is sometimes suggested that we are to attribute the war, in no small measure, to the spread of those liberal tendencies in religion which have shown themselves, more or less, clearly in nearly all organised bodies of Christians. We are told by some that liberal Christianity has been so discredited that it will cease to exercise any influence, and men will go back to the old uncritical beliefs of the past.

There are, again, others who point to the growing sympathy which has been drawn out and has shown itself here and there in a willingness to lay aside old rules and to break down traditional barriers, and who see in this a sign and a promise of a closer union among the various divided Churches. They look forward to a great Kikuyu on a world-wide scale, which

will prove the easy solution of all our difficulties. But what is evident right through it all is this, that each man seems to see that his own principles will emerge triumphant, and that all others will be finally discredited. His own particular sect or party holds the key to the entire problem. That is the most disquieting feature of the present situation. It points to either an inability to appreciate the gravity of the times or a deliberate refusal to reconsider our own first principles.

Now, has the modern Churchman anything that he can contribute to the solution of this problem? Has he any message of his own to a distracted world? What is his outlook upon the future of Christianity and the Christian Church. Ultimately his position must depend upon that. It is only the sureness of his outlook which will justify his position in the Church to-day. Now, what has a modern Churchman got to say?

In the first place, I think he will be very sceptical of the kind of answers that are generally given, and some of which we have already noticed. Not one of them seems to go deep enough. They are all too obviously framed in accordance with pre-conceived ideas to be adequate to an entirely new situation. Secondly, I am sure that he cannot look out upon the future without serious misgivings. He must be alive to the dangers which beset the path of religion, and to his mind these dangers are all the greater because so many prominent religious teachers seem to be entirely unconscious of them. There may very likely be a period in which old superstitions will raise up their heads, and claims, which had been all but abandoned, will be reasserted. The forces of reaction may take temporary advantage of the confusion into which we have been thrown, and gain a passing influence by offering some clear-cut and easy solution. There may be for religion a dark hour before the dawn. But in spite of all that, perhaps just because of it, the modern Churchman can contemplate the future with hope, and he grounds his hope on the very things which to others may seem the warnings of disaster. He is

ready to admit the widespread failure of traditional and organised Christianity in the past. That does not mean that here and there it has not had wonderful success. Here and there you can point to great results upon the old lines,—a well worked parish or an abundantly fruitful ministry; but on the whole it has failed so thoroughly to permeate and change modern life as to have been unable to save it from catastrophe. He recognises on all hands signs of a complete breakdown of ecclesiastical systems. They no longer correspond to the actual facts of human life. They have become utterly conventional and artificial. He cannot believe that they will be accepted and tolerated much longer. And it is just these facts, the failure of traditional forms, and the breakdown of long-standing barriers, which seem to usher in a new dispensation. The light is already breaking through the clouds. There will dawn upon the expectant vision of the world a new revelation of truth. Christianity will be seen in its larger, its deeper, and its truer meanings. That will be for our generation the return of the Son of man in power and in great glory. It will be a second coming of Christ to the world. In what forms the new truth will be expressed we cannot say. What changes it may work in the life of all the Churches, we do not know. How much we shall have to give up of all that we have held most dear, and how much we shall be allowed to retain, is as yet uncertain. For my own part I believe that those changes will be far greater than even the boldest of us dares to think. But that does not matter. The loss will be swallowed up in gain if only we see the Father through Christ more clearly, and all that now hides Him from us has been swept away.

THE CHURCH IN THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE.*

An Ordinary Layman's View.

By Cyril Norwood, Litt. D., Headmaster of Marlborough College.

It has not infrequently been remarked that prophecy is gratuitous folly, but at a moment when we are as a nation at death-grips with the most dangerous enemy we have ever faced, and when all activities save those of the war are in suspense, it is impossible to keep the mind from dwelling upon what must come after the war, supposing that, as we hope, all goes well. We must think over now what we mean to do when we are free to move, and the rough forecast and tentative opinions which I offer are meant as no more than a contribution to that task.

There seem to me to be two new conditions likely to be established which must affect and indeed govern the whole work of the Church of England, if it is to become in very truth a National Church. The first condition will arise from the fact that practically the whole young manhood of the nation will come home fresh from looking death in the face in the trenches, fresh from loss, pain, and sacrifice; they will most of them have been in positions where all conventions were stripped away, and there was nothing left to depend upon save simple manhood, honour, fellowship, and the nearness of God. They cannot but have reflected how unreal at such moments their party differences and their denominational distinctions became, indeed how they utterly vanished, and were felt to be meaningless; they will remember how glad they were to do a kindness to or to receive a kindness from any comrade, whether he was Tory or Radical, Catholic or Baptist, trade unionist or blackleg, rich or poor; they will remember that it was enough that he was a man and a comrade. Surely the splendid comradeship, the splendid sacrifice of the new armies, will for a generation at anyrate colour and animate the whole of our traditional life, nor will party and sect so openly face the light.

The second condition will arise if we win a decisive victory, and re-shape Europe according to the principles for which we have fought. We shall then, as we hope, have re-established that inheritance of civilisation, in which our common Christianity, our culture, and our hope of the growth of international law and morality are all alike based. We shall have made good for all nationalities, however small, the right to self-development, if not in all cases to full political independence; we shall have given them a guarantee of security and respect, and left them free to make their own peculiar contributions to the common stock of Europe. We shall have secured this, and we shall maintain it, by the alliance of mighty nations,

* This paper was read at the Public Meeting of the Churchmen's Union at Sion College, on 6th July.

themselves representing different traditions, and looking forward to different futures. If we are faithful to our ideals, we shall have brought it about, that there shall be a single European civilisation, yet of almost infinite diversity of operation, that there shall exist the identity that common membership of a great system affords, yet unchecked freedom for the constituent parts. And all this will be obvious to the plainest citizen, and if it is successful, it must shape and react upon all his conceptions of church membership and the relations of the churches. He will reflect that there too, so long as there is unity of the spirit, diversity of history, diversity of form, diversity of work will not matter; he will argue that, if the self-development of the small nationality is of value in itself, much the same arguments will defend the freedom, and claim the recognition of the small denomination; there too the method of the Allies is right, and the method of Prussia is wrong. The spirit of the time will aid the movement towards the reunion of Christendom along the road over which progress seems practicable, nor in the far future will a federated Europe seem impossible when based, as it might be based, on federated and re-united Christendom.

But men will also feel that the organised churches, as they have known them before the war, failed, and they will doubtless say many things in their haste, as they are doing already, which are not entirely true and justified. But they will come steadily to realise that it is not Christianity that has failed, but the stereotyped interpretation of it that clergy and laity have offered in organisations which have everywhere in Catholic and Protestant quarters alike allowed themselves to fall out of touch with the realities of human thought and life. The channels have been growing dry, and the river of progress has been cutting itself a new course. It seems to be certain that, with the nation as it will live and work after the war, a Church that is exclusive and unsympathetic towards Christians without its own borders will have no influence at all, and if any predominant party succeeds in carrying our own Church in that direction, it will carry it, so far as the main currents of the age are concerned, into the backwaters of historic survival. The bulk of the laity will leave it, as has been well said, in order to be Christian. But foreseen dangers are most easily avoided, and there is enough vitality and power of re-adjustment in the Church to enable its adherents to face the future with the great hope of men who feel that they have a great opportunity.

It would take me a long time to justify fully the faith that is in me, and, indeed, much that I should say has already been better stated both in our own magazine and in many other quarters. I pass by the increasing readiness of the clergy to state the faith in terms which the layman of to-day can understand, and to admit the validity of modern processes of thought and research. I pass by the steady and increasing tendency, visible in the Nonconformist Churches, to feel the way towards greater unity, and the

dropping of differences not essential. I pass by the processes so characteristic of our nation, by which, both in the mission field and in the colonies, men accept, because it arises from a practical situation, the recognition of their essential unity with their fellow Christians, which they totally neglected, so long as it was pressed upon them merely as a matter of reason. I pass by all these matters, but I recognise that they all possess great influence in moulding the opinion of the laymen of the Empire.

I would rather draw attention to the fact that there are many movements in existence, for the most part lay in origin and in inspiration, affecting great portions of the population, which are out of touch with the Church to the Church's great detriment. It is easy to dismiss them as merely humanitarian or educational, or even materialist in outlook, but they draw to themselves the energy of the ordinary laity. It is not necessary to be exhaustive; examples will suffice. An interesting article in the April *Modern Churchman* described the Adult School Movement with its 1,883 schools. It is a lay movement in its entirety, and it is growing. Connected with it in many cities is the Workers' Educational Association, wider in its range, ready and anxious to study anything and everything in the spirit of free research and not of authority; this, too, has a great future before it and maintains hitherto an open mind. In all the towns and cities of the country there is a flourishing Brotherhood movement, most frequently connected with Nonconformist centres, but often begun and carried on by laymen, and where so carried on, ready, in my experience, to hear Churchmen and to welcome them. It represents a great force of good-will and fellowship which exists throughout the nation, and of which the Church must make use. There is the Young Men's Christian Association—in the past, often narrow, sometimes sectarian, in its outlook, but never committed to one point of view. The general forces of Christian good-will, of which I am speaking, had been gathering within it for some years, during which, learning from its experience in America and the colonies, it had been widening its sympathies. Therefore, when the war began, it was able to jump to its opportunity, and because it went about its task in the broadest spirit of Christian charity and not in any spirit of sectarianism, money to the extent of many hundreds of thousands of pounds, and indeed millions, was poured into its hands by all classes of the community. That Association is ready and anxious to have the co-operation of Churchmen; they are welcome to its Councils. But from the Church, as it was before the war, it often found it hard to draw many recruits.

The Church must not remain blind to these movements, and others like them, which constitute, when rightly used, so many opportunities. It is in these that the Christianity of much of the nation, deplored almost daily as indifferent to Church and Chapel, is expressing itself. The period of preparation for the Mission of the Church to the nation seems surely the

right time for Churchmen to consider the signs of the times, and if the stream will not flow along the old channels, to provide the new channels along which it will flow. One instrument lies at hand in the Church of England Men's Society which, with a wider outlook, and a greater energy, has the power to do much if it can be kept out of the hands of the ecclesiastically-minded layman. Another promising line of action leads through the breaking of barriers which too much separate the lay and the clerical world to a larger and readier interest in social and educational lay and popular movements.

It has hitherto been counted the characteristic of religion as expressed by established churches to hallow the *status quo*: revolutionary and reforming in origin, by slow insensible process they become parasitic. A living religion must express itself in action, and after the war the Church of England must not be content with formal services, and the keeping of a certain ecclesiastical rule and order, but it must develop a social conscience, it must have a real interest in social and labour problems. It is the general opinion that in the past generation, when society has been lying wounded, the Church, too often like the Priest and the Levite, has been passing by on the other side. This, too, I need not develop, but it accounts for the fact that so large a part of the educated laity, and virtually the whole of the Labour movement, are untouched and uninfluenced by the Church.

The field is not lost, but there is needed a change of mind. Given that change, which now if ever, we are given a golden opportunity to make, there is great hope that the Church of England may become the Church of the nation again, and a golden link some day in the re-union of Christendom.

THE CHURCH'S FAILURE AND SOME REMEDIES.*

By the Rev. Canon Streeter, Dean of Queen's College, Oxford.

Unless my own experience is a very unusual one, the prevailing feeling in the Church of England about the National Mission is not at all optimistic. Like other Englishmen in this hour of grim struggle we clergy are above all things anxious to do our bit. The leaders of the nation have issued a call for service in the war, and five million men have voluntarily responded. And now the leaders of the Church have issued the call, and we clergy and the little band of keen church workers that are attached to every parish are

* This paper was read at the Public Meeting of the Churchmen's Union at Sion College, on 6th July. In a slightly modified form it is being published as a National Mission pamphlet by the S.P.C.K.—Ed. *M.C.*

not going to show less readiness to respond to the call of duty. We are ready to work, to think, to pray, we are ready to sacrifice personal prejudices, to take risks, to try experiments as never before. But along with all this readiness to serve is a deep and wide-spread despondency. Whenever two or three clergy or Church workers are gathered together and express their real feelings, there are head shakings, avowals of a deep misgiving that this National Mission is going to be a ghastly failure. We feel it must fail for three main reasons. First, the forces at our command are inadequate—so many of the youngest and most vigorous of the clergy are away as chaplains, so many of our best and keenest workers, men and women, are either away or are fully occupied at home with war work. Secondly, had we the forces, we doubt the reception of our message. People are much too much occupied with the war to take the slightest notice of a Mission. Thirdly, we ask, what is the good of telling the nation to repent just now, when it knows it is fighting for the cause of righteousness—and when it has shown an amount of heroism, sacrifice, and discipline of which neither our enemies, nor our friends, nor we ourselves ever supposed it to be capable. No doubt the nation has plenty of sins to repent of, but is this the moment to insist on the fact, is this a time when we can reasonably expect men to listen to this particular call? Such, so far as I can judge, is a very general feeling among the clergy. What about the laity? Well, of course, opinion differs on this as on every other subject, but there is at anyrate a very wide-spread feeling in large and influential circles of the laity that this war is altogether too big a proposition for our ordinary theology and religion to grasp. The questions it raises seem too big for the answers we are in the habit of giving. Ordinary Christian teaching about the reign of Providence, about the justice of God, and the purpose of suffering and the like, somehow seems to offer too cheap and easy, too light a solution of the problems of a time like this. And prayer in particular—prayer which is the very life of religion—seems to the majority too faint and feeble an expedient to bring help at such a time.

I think, too, that the clergy have made a mistake in regard to the war similar to that made by the nation. We have been taken by surprise by a situation of unexampled magnitude, and we have hurriedly improvised ways of dealing with it which were wholly inadequate to the occasion. In particular we have made two great mistakes.

(1) We have tried, as the phrase goes, to "mobilise the spiritual forces of the nation" in the matter of prayer. But we have omitted to think out and to teach the people the real meaning of prayer, how to pray, and what to expect from it. The result has been much wasted effort, much disillusionment and disappointment among our flocks—as is shown by the remarkable but undoubted fact that instead of an increase there has actually been a decrease in attendance at Intercession Services since the war began.

(2) We have tried to rouse the indifferent by emphasizing the thought of the war as a judgment sent by God. The idea is an obvious one, and most of us, I suppose, took it for granted that it was true, and preached it when war first broke out. There may be an element of truth in it, though personally I have come to think it is a very small one, but I suppose as time has gone on most of us have begun to wonder whether we have not clutched at a much too cheap and easy solution of the problem of evil, and to suspect that we have made a big mistake in the way many of us have insisted on the idea of war as the scourge of God. Facts don't seem to bear out that view. A judgment sent by God should at least evince conspicuous justice in its working. But if the horrors and desolation wrought by war are a judgment sent by God, why is it that the main brunt of them falls upon nations like Serbia and Poland, nations which for centuries have been more sinned against than sinning; why is it that the toll in death and wounds falls in every nation upon the best and noblest, not on the criminal or the shirker? The things which have happened in Serbia and Poland, in Belgium and Armenia, look much more like the work of the devil than of God. The problem how to reconcile the horrors of a war like this with a belief in Divine Providence weighs heavily on the minds of men, but I am convinced that the attempt to solve it by the assumption that it is all a judgment for sin is so obviously inadequate that it has weakened the hold of the Church on educated and uneducated alike. There is not in England, as in many Roman Catholic countries, any special hostility to the Church or to the clergy. But there is a vaguely expressed but almost universal feeling that the Church indeed has proved itself inadequate to deal with a crisis like the present, that Christianity is all very well in ordinary quiet times, but that somehow or other it is not a big enough thing to help men through in times like these. It is felt rather than said that Christianity may be very useful for children, and for quiet old folk who have retired from the world's struggle, but that the rest of us want something more practical, more heroic, more inspiring. "The God that answereth by fire let him be God." But somehow the fire seems to have gone out. In a world ablaze Christianity is felt to be too tame.

But is Christianity too tame, is the Gospel unpractical, unheroic, uninspiring? Emphatically, No! It is not the Christianity of Christ, but Christianity as we clergy have taught it, Christianity as it has shown itself in the lives of the clergy and our devout laity that strikes the world as unpractical, unheroic, uninspiring. But if that is the case the call to repentance must first be preached to, and responded to, by ourselves, and then we shall have something to say to the world outside. Not till the Christian Church strikes the world outside as a body of men and women inspired with a great hope, transformed with a passionate enthusiasm, taking the lead in every crusade against tyranny, ignorance, and legalized vice—

not till that happens will the world begin to listen when we cry Repent. For years we have dinned it into folk "do not commit adultery, do not gamble, do not get drunk, come regularly to church," and the world hasn't listened to us. Why should we expect to find a change now? The reason why the world is given over to the race for wealth or power, or to the pursuit of luxury and vice, is that they find these things exciting, they appear to give life the glamour of adventure and romance. We shall never persuade the world to give up these pursuits until we present Christianity as something more interesting and more exciting, as something which involves more adventure and more romance than ever can be got from the world, the flesh and the devil.

A friend of mine who was home on leave told me of a private in his regiment who had been a professional burglar. This man frequently showed conspicuous bravery in bringing back wounded comrades at the peril of his life, more than that he acted like a father to another private in the company, a mere boy, especially in keeping him out of certain of the temptations of a soldier's life. But he made no secret of his intention of going back to his life as a burglar when the war was over. Something is wrong with the ordinary presentation of Christianity when a man like that is outside the Church.

Where is it that we have gone astray? We have, I believe, made two mistakes, one in our teaching and one in our practice.

First in our teaching. When we ought to have preached the Gospel, we have preached the Law. Instead of telling men to love God we have taught them to fear Him, instead of telling them to attempt great things we have told them to avoid pitfalls. We have held up before their eyes the penalty of failure rather than the crown of victory. An army that is always on the defensive gets demoralized and depressed, the Church Militant is no exception to this rule.

Secondly, in our practice we have failed to make membership in the Church a thing which seems worth having to the majority. The main reason for this is the refusal of any constitutional rights to the laity in the management of Church affairs. It is the great boast of Englishmen that as a result of a long struggle of 300 years or more we have realized, and led the world to realize, the possibility of liberty,—liberty "broadening out," as Tennyson puts it, "from precedent to precedent," and of that spirit of enterprise, of individual initiative and individual responsibility, which can only arise when freedom exists. It is because we feel that we are fighting for the dominance in Europe of the idea of liberty, as against the Prussian idea of an efficient bureaucratic despotism, that for the first time in its history the nation is absolutely united in the prosecution of a war. But the one conspicuous place where we have failed to realize an ordered liberty is in the Church of England. No doubt those of the laity who are persons of wealth or social

position have in practice full opportunities of making their influence felt in Church affairs. But so far as what we call the lower middle and the labouring classes are concerned, the system of the Church of England is a benevolent despotism. Beyond the right of electing one churchwarden with very limited powers the laity, male and female, have no constitutional rights, they have no say at all in the management of parish affairs, and the inevitable result is that the Church is regarded merely as a concern of the parson's. The labourer goes to church when he wants to get some religion, just as he goes to the public house when he wants to get some drink, but he no more feels that it is his church than he feels that it is his public house. He feels himself to be not a member of the Church but just a customer. We preach about the privilege and responsibility of Baptism, we talk of the priesthood of the laity. We must continue to preach this, but we must also supplement our talking by giving the laity real responsibility, and real power—not sham responsibility and sham power. Only when this is done will membership of the Church cease to be a mere name to the vast majority, and when membership is a mere name the responsibility of effort and of witness in the corporate crusade against the powers of evil in the self and in the world has lost half its inspiration. At present the Church is like an army in which only the officers think they are called upon to fight.

Our main task, then, in this National Mission is (1) to renew our vision of the real meaning of Christianity, and to present it to our people as a gospel of power, as a challenge to the world, as a life of heroic effort and desperate adventure. (2) To set to work to make practical changes in organization and in the practical activities in the parish which will tend to make the people feel that the Church is a society of which they are real members, of which they are proud to be members; in whose practical and spiritual witness they no less than the clergy have a vital interest.

This being the situation it may well be asked what suggestions I have to make of an immediate and practical character. What definite things can and should be attempted here and now?

Time is short, so what I have to say I will say baldly and dogmatically. But though I speak baldly and dogmatically it is only for brevity's sake, not because I do not realize the great difficulties of putting some of these suggestions into practice. But I make them, knowing that I speak to men who are ready to face difficulties, yea more, are determined to overcome them. The difficulties are indeed in some cases, to those who know the actual facts of parish life, almost insuperable. But during the last two years this nation has learnt a lesson, the lesson that difficulties apparently insuperable can be overcome; and what the nation can do the Church can do also. I will state some of the chief things which it seems to me ought to be done, leaving out of account for the time being the difficulties involved.

(1) Let there be established in every parish a Church Council. Let means be taken to see that it represents, not merely the influential laity and the keen Church workers, but also the less educated and the poorer. When the Council meets in all discussions let effort be made to encourage free expression of opinion by the shyer and humbler members. This, especially in country districts, will be the greatest difficulty of all. It will need constant vigilance and tact on the part both of clergy and leading laity to see that a real expression of opinion by these is forthcoming. It may take years before the labourer will dare to believe that the parson and the squire really wish to hear his views, and only the more so if those views happen to differ from their own—but a beginning may be made at once. Above all let real power and responsibility be given to the Council in matters of finance and administration. Even in regard to the difficult question of Church Services, which are obviously the special concern of the Incumbent, I think it would be wise to make the rule that no change in existing practice should be made without the consent of both Incumbent and Council.

To begin with, a really efficient Vicar might often find such a Council an encumbrance rather than an aid to the proper working of a parish. That is only to be expected. Autocratic institutions, given a good and intelligent autocrat, are always more efficient than democratic. We know to our cost that Prussian autocracy is in many ways more efficient than British constitutionalism, but for all that we claim that the moral fruits of liberty are worth a big sacrifice of efficiency. And if this is true of the State, how much more of the Church. Development of individual character, individual interest, individual initiative, and the sense of individual responsibility, are far more valuable than conformity even to the wisest rules, or than mere obedience even to the most intelligent direction, and if in its earlier stages the development of these means, as it often will do, some sacrifice of immediate efficiency, the sacrifice is well worth making.

(2) The active individual co-operation of the laity in Church government, in finance and administration is the first step, but it is valuable chiefly as a means to an end which is far more important, and that is the active co-operation of the laity in the intellectual, moral and spiritual witness of the Church. I will suggest three main ways.

(*a*) Mr. Temple's National Mission pamphlet, *The Call of the Kingdom*, is a forcible statement of the need for the Church to take more seriously its responsibility towards Social Reforms and Missionary problems. But if we ask ourselves why in the past the Church as a whole has not done its duty in these respects, the answer is, I believe, that it is quite as much due to ignorance as to anything else. How could it be expected that the Church should do its duty in this way when so few of its members have any notion of what it is all about ?

The rich do not really know how the poor live. People in the country have never seen a London slum. English people have no notion of what heathenism means in practice to the multitudes in India, or Africa, or China, who are born and live and die in its baleful shadow. It is very largely because Christians do not know the ugly facts that they do not hasten to remedy them. What is wanted, then, is an increase among average Church-people of an intelligent study of social conditions at home, and of missionary conditions abroad. The best method of securing this in practice has been found to be what is known as a Study Circle—that is, a group of say half-a-dozen people who meet together once a week for a couple of months for discussion on the basis of a text book specially designed for the purpose. A clergyman, or a keen layman or lay-woman, could do no better service at this time than by starting a Study Circle, with the idea that the members of this Circle should later on become leaders of Circles of their own.

(*b*) The laity should be encouraged to greater activity in prayer, the Churches should always be open, and the idea should be encouraged that it is a natural and ordinary thing for a passer by to go in for a few minutes for prayer or quiet meditation. This is done in many Churches, but, besides this, small groups of people who are bound together by any special interest—the members of a particular Study Circle for instance—should be encouraged to go to the church in a body for corporate prayer or meditation, and if their leader or any other of the group feels moved to pray aloud, let him do so. This, of course, would be allowed only at times when no other service was going on. In practice, of course, only a few of the keener and more earnest members of the parish would take advantage of this. But it would be an immense strength and source of inspiration to these few.

In the regular services of the Church, the Church of England is, I am sure, right in confining the vocal prayers to the clergyman, and in using a liturgy. But I am equally sure that outside the regular services the idea that nobody but the parson may open his mouth in Church, and that all prayer must be from a book has had a most depressing effect on the spiritual life of the laity. One of the most valuable of tracts published for the National Mission is that of Mr. Cyril Hepher, on *Waiting upon God*, No. 7, price ½d. Every clergyman should read this carefully, and bring it to the notice of the keener Church workers.

(*c*) We all know Macaulay's famous remarks about the converted tinker, how that the Church of Rome can make use of his real though ignorant enthusiasm, and by putting him in a friar's habit, makes him her champion, while the Church of England can only make him an enemy by driving him to found a nonconformist sect. It is three-quarters of a century since Macaulay told us this, but we still do little or nothing to encourage the laity, even educated laity, to take their part in the propagandist work of the

Church. Of course, in no one parish is it likely that more than two or three persons, if that, should feel any desire to attempt this kind of work. Yet in almost every Y.M.C.A tent among troops at home or abroad there is at present some layman who from time to time in more or less informal ways is trying, and often with success, to bring home the meaning of Christianity to fellow laymen. Surely it should be our first duty to see that when the war ends we provide opportunities for the same kind of work to continue. And when we speak of lay preaching we must not forget the fact that many women have a great power of bringing home the Christian message—as the Women Pilgrimages in various dioceses during the last two years have abundantly shewn.

From many quarters there is being impressed upon us the need of reviving the spirit of fellowship in the Church. Among educated people the Anglican and Free Church Fellowship Movement is a result of this felt need. It is felt even more acutely among the less educated. The Bishop of London has publicly quoted the case of a soldier who said he found in the Y.M.C.A. a sense of brotherhood and feeling of home which he had never found in the Church of England—and all who have worked with troops will tell one of similar instances. We must preach fellowship, but we must do more than that. A real feeling of brotherhood only grows up round institutions which are a centre and an embodiment of a common social life. Clubs, recreation-rooms, &c., connected with the Church exist in many parishes—where they do not they should be started without delay. But though in many cases these are a great success, it must be recognised that in many others such institutions have in practice worked out in a way which has been very disappointing to those who, often at a cost of great effort and sacrifice, have established them. I believe, however, that with a more democratic management and some improvements in methods this could be altered. What is wanted is a careful study of the methods used in Adult Schools and Benefit Societies, by the Boy Scout Movement, and in the *more successful* branches and huts of the Y.M.C.A.—for, be it noted, all Y.M.C.A. effort has not been uniformly successful, there is a great difference between one branch and another and between one hut and another. But the full advantage of such institutions will never be reaped until changes in the spirit and system of parish organizations, such as I have indicated before, have begun to make their effect felt. The administrative, the social and the spiritual life of any community are interdependent. Improvement in anyone stimulates all, weakness in any one depresses all.

The difficulty of putting into operation any of the reforms I have suggested would under any circumstances be immense, especially in small country parishes. It is still more difficult now when nearly all the more active and energetic men who should be the driving power in Church

Councils and in parish institutions are away. But we look forward to the time when they will come back. And they will not come back from their terrible experiencess the same as they went away. Some will come back better men, some will come back worse. All will come back with more experience, more independence, more initiative than before. They will not be content to go back into the old ways. They will expect far more from the Church than they did of old, and unless they get it they will have nothing more to do with her.

Our parish councils, our recreation rooms, our new experiments will work slowly and feebly at first, for the obvious reason that the men who should be the life and soul of them are all away. But we must build for the future, we must get ready against "the day when the boys come home." If our machinery is ready and working, however feebly, if we can say to each one as he returns, "here is a job where we want your help, here is a matter in which we want your advice, here is a machine ready going, only waiting for some young blood to make it really hum." If we can show them that the Church has really been doing something while they were away, and wants their energy and experience to really make things go—if we can do this, we need not fear their response. They have learnt the meaning of sacrifice, they have learnt the glory of service. They have served their King, they have served their country, they have served their God abroad—if only *we* give them free scope and the invitation to real and free activity, if only *we* give them the chance and the opportunity they will serve their God at home.

In August, 1914, most of us supposed that the War would be over in three months, and that our existing Army, slightly increased and improved, would suffice. The end of the War is not yet in sight, and it has been found necessary to reorganise not only the Army, but the whole nation from top to bottom. Do not let the Church repeat the old mistake. This National Mission is a great crusade against the forces of the world, the flesh, and the devil. Don't let us suppose the Church's war will be over in three months. Let us rather recognize that the conclusion of peace in the international sphere will probably be followed by a period of unparalleled general demoralization, and of social and political revolution. The end of the European War will be but the beginning of the acute stage of that other war which the Church is called upon to undertake. Let us then begin now while there is yet time to set our house in order. In faith and in hope, in courage and in enterprise, in methods and in organization, the Church must be absolutely transformed if it is to lead the nation in the times that are to come. Those who say that the nation will not listen to a Mission of Repentance and Hope are right. They will not listen now. It is we that must first seek a renewal both in spirit and in methods, it is we that must acquire a new vision and a new hope. Then afterwards the world will hear.

DEAD ANGLICANISM AND LIVING.*

By Rev. Hubert Handley, M.A., formerly Vicar of St. Thomas's, Camden Town, N.W.

"Lazarus, come forth."—*St. John xi.* 43.

A great philosopher has interpreted for us the Egyptian Sphinx. That human face looking out from that brute body. It means, we are told, the Spiritual emerging from the merely Natural—higher life disentangling itself from, freeing itself from, issuing from lower life. Higher life from lower life: we may loosely take this as the formula of the whole evolutionary process, from terrestrial origins to terrestrial climax. First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear—the evolutionary process is this on the secular scale. The law is: life from life.

Turn to the Crucifix. A new group of conditions faces us—all those adverse, formidable, sometimes abhorrent conditions which we name *death.* Death in its widest sense—physical, mental, moral, spiritual; death is deliberately faced and surmounted by that Figure on the Cross. I am not assigning victory (of course I have not the capacity) to the one side or the other in the contest between those who claim Christianity as a religion of development and those who claim it as a religion of redemption. Perhaps the two views are not, the one to the other, irretrievably oppugnant. Perhaps the development may contain the redemption, or the redemption the development: I do not know. But a religion of redemption in the above sense, Christianity incontestably is; it does tackle *death* in its widest meaning and connotations. The achievement now is not life from life, but life from death. *Mors janua vitæ.* "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

* The Annual Sermon of the Churchmen's Union, preached in St. Sepulchre's Church, Holborn, July 6th, at the Service of Holy Communion.

And in Christian history large movements arise in obedience to this principle—life from death, life surmounting death. Notice two.

There is Monasticism. Years ago some of us read a noble, memorable book, Montalembert's *Monks of the West*. There you have it, life rising from death. There is the moral death of Roman society, there is grossness, squalor, the welter of licence, corruption going ahead and eating its way into the social vitals. And from these foul circumstances arise the moral life and rebuke and mastery of asceticism, of the religious orders; not a normal morality, I allow; an unusual morality; but a lofty morality, and a morality, for its purpose, triumphant. And it arises, not easily, as mature life from immature, but by reaction, by protest and disgust, as life from death. From that moral pit the Disposer of events summons it: Let moral life arise! Monasticism, come forth!

There is the Reformation. Corruption now prevails, not in civil society, but within the very Church. Death is working here; at its worst, say, the moral death of Rome in the days of Alexander VI. But through three hundred years the competing and surmounting life comes forth in superiority. Look at our own country. Start with the fierce controversal tracts of Wyclif, and note the mounting waves of moral vigour; note, in passing, the superb English prose in which the moral force finds vent—through Tyndale, Latimer to Bunyan and Milton. It is the grand recovery of conscience, of individual rectitude, from corporate wickedness. From those old Church caves and haunts and lurking places of vice, God, who sitteth over all from the beginning, commands the issue of revival. Reformation, come forth!

The Church to-day is dead of another disease. Our Church of England, with which we here this morning are immediately concerned is, perhaps, first or most of all so dead. It is dead of conventionality. When we say "dead" the word is, of course, used loosely, approximately, with literary freeness; the Church and its faithful members and its blest activities are

never wholly dead. But if the pre-Reformation Church may roughly be said to have been dead of corruption, the Church of England to-day may roughly be said to be dead of conventionality. Hot, glaring sins do not disfigure us; there is nothing loudly wrong about us, nothing notorious and disreputable. But we are dead of primness, of thinness, of theological priggishness and etiquette; we are tied up and choked with spiritual propriety; routine, with unintelligent dead-weight, has squeezed the breath out of us; we are wrapped round and round with a covering of worn-out phrases. Heaven! let us breathe. Burst these ligatures! Give us freedom, give us light, give us life!

Move on to particulars. First, we die of doctrinal conventionality. The spiritual experience is alive. But the doctrine which should match it, which should rationally endeavour to stammer out and indicate the energetic facts of that spiritual experience—this, the doctrine, often is not alive, often it is dried up with conventionality and staleness. Pass, for instance, several great festivals of the Church in review.

There is Christmas. "And there were in the same country shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flock by night. . . . And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill toward men.'" Ah! the sweet, incomparable tale. Christmas would not be Christmas without it. The wintry morning, the loved English landscape itself, the snow on the Warwickshire trees, on the Cumberland hills—it would not shine with its proper light unless in the Church of our fathers we go and hear once more the blest story. But to insist to us that this narrative, that the whole narrative of those two precious first chapters of St. Luke, to insist that these statements are severe, literal history, are bare prose such as would be an official and revised account of, say, the coronation of King George V. or the death of Pope Pius X.; to insist that the evangelical report

is journalistic, is annalistic like that; to insist that, under pain of heretical taint we Churchmen, we clergy, must thus take or leave the whole record—that is a doctrinal method which is dead. Conventional and defunct it is abandoned by us. For us the interpretation of that sacred story of the Nativity is quick and rich with significance; read in historical perspective, whatever be the final literal verdict in the matter of the critical experts, the story lights up early belief in the Incarnation, which, however, for us is based on the far wider grounds of the complete New Testament history and of subsequent age-long experience. Thus let living interpretation come forth!

Again, there is for the Christmas festival a theological argument of the dead, *a priori* kind. Dr. Illingworth is a name held in honour by us all. He was a Churchman whose grateful pupils most of us in some way have been. Strange it seems that he should rear the Christmas festival upon presuppositions of the following lax kind. A child born of two human parents could not, he holds, break the infection of sin in mankind; he says, if I remember rightly, that it is "doubly impossible" to conceive a break thus effected. But he holds it possible that the break may be achieved by a child born of one human parent. Yet this familiar contention, though adopted by this distinguished man, appears to us to be a mere remnant of lifeless dialectic. To build the future defences of the Incarnation not on the granite of wide witness and long experience, but on an *a priori* argument like that, packed with indefensible assumption which may crumble beneath the tread of the first thoughtful man who steps upon it—that is an interpretation of the doctrine of the Incarnation which we believe to be dead. Away with it! Let living interpretation come forth!

Again, there is Easter. Like reflections apply. The fact of the Resurrection of our Lord is really learned from a wide area of historical record; from Christophanies at sundry times and in diver manners, in the upper room, in or about the holy city, by the Galilean Lake, on the Damascus road; from the

evident deep belief of the early Christians, from wide testimony, from a whole wide current of testimony, to striking fruits of that belief within the Christian society. This is a large, open area of witness. But now to narrow this down, to insist that the august Fact of the Resurrection must be learnt essentially from obscure happenings within the sacred Tomb, to pry almost indelicately into those hidden happenings, to desert that other extended field of historical evidence for this thin line, this thin ridge of mysterious, unseen, unknown incidents within that sacred Rock, to make the traditional interpretation of those incidents, whatever the ultimate verdict of criticism may be, a *sine qua non* of Resurrection doctrine—this we hold to be reckless theology and dead method. Here in this church of the Holy Sepulchre we offer to our fellow Churchmen our method as more scrupulous, more reverent, more sure, more alive.

Pass to Ascension Day. The related events here have become more and more dim. It is as if a scene once thrown sharp and clear on the lantern sheet had, by the operator's turn of a screw, become pale and blurred. The most belligerent traditionalists, hunted into a corner by the critics, stand at bay and try in the matter to say something coherent. They do not succeed. We do not try. The record, as to definite events, leaves us avowedly and reverently perplexed. But the lesson of Ascension Day is independent of those critical troubles. Paulus, the famous critic, died saying, "There is another world." *There is another world*—there is the enduring lesson of Ascension Day. Oh! it is a lesson we need; victims of transiency, floating about amid these shifting and failing phenomena around us, we want *another world*. This crowd in Holborn wants it, in the Stock Exchange hard by they want it, in the Prudential Assurance Society, in the trenches, on the high seas. The human heart wants another world. And on Ascension Day to the docile and reverent consciousness of Christendom, apart from details of Biblical criticism, another world, blessed be God, is impressively announced and disclosed.

Last festival, there is Trinity Sunday. You must approach the consideration of this doctrine with bowed head. The Eternal One has declared Himself to the waiting Christian Society in terms of Trinity; Christian experience has learnt of Him through Father, Son, and Spirit; Christian experience is Trinitarian; the Unitarian effort, however, we may respect its intellectual contribution, turns down the light and God becomes more pale and remote. We in awe and fidelity kneel as we catch these supreme glimpses of the Most High; we seek to stammer them out in scripture and creed and hymn on Trinity Sunday. "Holy, Holy, Holy! though the darkness hide Thee, though the eye of sinful man Thy glory may not see." But now come with me to the annual inspection of a church school. The inspector, a member of the Hard Church party, arrives with his Tritheism all ready. Poor children! He questions them as to which of his three Gods did this and which did that. In reply a little boy holds up his hand here, makes an unfortunate choice, sits down discomfited; a little girl holds up her hand there, is mistaken, and dare not answer again. It is mere arithmetical juggling. No mystery, no awe, no sense of human weakness before these sovereign verities; "lo, these are parts of his ways; but how little a portion is heard of him? but the thunder of his power who can understand?"—no notion of this sublime humility; no spiritual faculty on the children's part brought into play at all; only numerical puzzles set before them, puzzles as little full of wonder and religion as is their own game of tit, tat, too! More religious by far is the work of the agnostic artist who reverently communes with Nature, and whose prayers are pictures. This is doctrinal conventionality, this is dead interpretation of doctrine. We need living interpretation. Living interpretation, come forth!

Not only, however, do we need *re-interpretation* of inherited doctrines. In parts we need *re-statement*. Is the creed-making faculty within the Christian society extinct? Why? It was active once, who told us it was effete? Dead or dormant only from disuse, it can revive. We of the Churchmen's Union do

not deny the creeds, we do not say that they are false; we say that in parts they are anachronistic, are mentally and linguistically inapt, that they effectively adumbrated immense realities of Christian faith for their own day, but that some of these immense realities they do not effectively adumbrate now. "He descended into hell": we hold that the truth implied here could be more livingly affirmed, and so with other clauses. And we believe that the Holy Spirit Who guides into all the truth will—not, perhaps, in our day, but in due time—guide into live and fitting utterance of His past and present revealings. We believe that at the right hour the Divine Command will summon from within the soul of the Christian Society once more the creed-making faculty. Creed-making faculty, creed-amending faculty, creed-reducing faculty, come forth!

Our Anglican relation to Nonconformists, to members of the Free Churches, have been evilly conventional—plausible without, rotten within. You must have lived in a small country town to have seen, in this respect, our quiet Anglican insolence at its pitch. We have treated Dissenters—as we have loved to call them, that title being the most depreciatory—we have treated Dissenters, especially have we clergy treated Dissenting ministers, with a subtle, indefinable, intolerable condescension; with cold, exterior courtesy, we have interiorly treated them as if they were of a lower caste, as if they had negro blood in their veins or dropped their *h's*. Real brotherhood died of these affronts. Yet there has been amendment of late years, and within the whole Christian society real brotherhood is stirring, pressing, knocking to break out. Burst the mischievous bonds of convention! Let brotherhood loose, let it have play! This is the first move towards closer harmony with Free Church brethren in other ways—in belief, in discipline, in worship. The first move is the loosing of living brotherhood; it, by its inherent moral power, will then gradually force its way through all hostile or retarding media towards that larger union and concord, under authority, which our souls desire. Living brotherhood, come forth!

A distinguished Englishman lately said to one of our members that in our country the Church and the nation flow side by side like two currents; but for the influence and interaction there is of the one on the other they might be oil and water. It reminded me of a passionate lament which I once read, spoken by the Spanish statesman Castelar at the close of the nineteenth century. I read it years ago and speak from memory; but, in effect, Castelar's indictment of the great Roman Church in his native land was this. Standing on the ruins of Spanish greatness and addressing Roman Catholicism, he said: "You have played for your own hand; you have sought your own interest; you have, no doubt, reared hot-house saints within your own precincts, and I give you credit for it; but the bounding life of Spain you have ignored; you have deserted the nation; and to-day the whole of my country, from the Pyrenees to the Sea of Cadiz, is a charnel house offered in sacrifice on the altar of the Roman Church." Church of England, beware! You, too, have erred: beware of this apostacy! Surging questions of the first moment will confront the nation after the war: questions of capital and labour; of the new sense of the meaning, responsibility, and use of money; of mitigating class distinctions; of the woman's movement; of scientific method in education; of the due place of pleasure and games in the national economy. These and like questions will clamour for solution. They will not be solved by clever programmes and ingenious device alone; these must be tools in the hands of something else. That something else must be the mutual *spirit of sacrifice.* The spirit of sacrifice! What is the Church here for but to suffuse the nation with that? What is that commanding symbol of ours there above the altar—Christ Crucified? What is that, our very inspiration and motive, but the spirit of sacrifice? Yet what conspicuously has this Church of ours achieved in sacrifice during the war? What at the front? Apart from fine individual Chaplains, what has our whole Church done at the front? Have we there at all equalled or approached the Y.M.C.A.? What at home?

Has the Church of England in her corporate capacity at home, in these days of imperative economy and surrender, when on all hands the peremptory national need is for example in unselfishness—has the Church of England as a Church been eminent in sacrifice? Have her leaders? Some of you at this point will not agree with me; but the preacher is not here for moral accommodation but to deliver a message from the eternal God. And as a priest of the Church of God in this land I bow my head in humiliation that the bishops, with one or two noble exceptions, have given no lead to this nation, at the hour of trial, in yielding up of worldly estate. On the contrary, I read in the leading Church journal a discussion on the point as to *which was the last bishop to wear a wig!* Amid the moral whirlwind of Europe, amid the concussion of nations, when the earth is opening her mouth to swallow up idolatries and trifling, Churchmen are gravely debating in their leading organ which was the last bishop to wear a wig! Why, brothers and sisters, heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ, if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified together—why, in many respects at this moment the whole Church of England is wearing a wig. Living lead to the nation, come forth!

Our society thus is called, in humble beginnings, to a surpassing task. Our nascent hopes are rising. You have felt the power of the Spirit in our cause. You know the *nerve* with which we face the future. Other parties in our Church seem to look forward with nervousness; we with nerve. You have shared the profound, unspeakable instinct within us that our arising life throbs with promise of the coming day. We must wait on God and renew our strength. Here are four notes, which the Spirit seems to teach us, of the Divine Will.

1. We must loyally accept the decision of authority to hold the National Mission, and we must give all the aid we can. Members of a great society, we must obey. The National Mission may not satisfy us in all regards: far from it. *Our own*

national mission seems to us to be more deep and vital and out-and-out. But that common call of the Church we must obey, and must work.

2. We must pray. Oh! pathetic. Through the long, dim ages the children of men have knocked at the doors of the awful Silence around us, and have felt that behind the partition, close to, is a Friend. There is magnificent pathos in the great heart of mankind persisting from generation to generation in this pursuit. This application at the portals of eternity we call Prayer. The English people, like their fathers, in their deep self want to pray. If we cannot lead them in prayer, we cannot lead them at all.

3. That same spirit of sacrifice must animate our Union. My young brother clergy, burn your boats! Our Cause is worth sacrifice. No slinking eye on promotion! promotion beside our Cause is contemptible. Tread down those black-eyed crawling snakes of ecclesiastical ambition, whose bite cripples! Tread them under, and you shall step out into the future *free*, knowing the might of the psalmist's word—*when thou hast set my heart at liberty.* Again, we must sacrifice time and labour, as do our Northern and Western groups. Again, we must sacrifice money. If an office in the Church House, as has been proposed, would further our Cause, money must unhesitatingly spring up. There is a well-known picture of St. Bernard preaching the Second Crusade: the listening crowd are all in an attitude, with hands stretched out and heads bent forward, of *offering*. So must we offer for our Crusade.

4. There must be fellowship amongst us. The most beautiful fruit hitherto of our movement was seen in our two Conferences, in 1914 at Ripon, last year at Rugby. We entered the Presence, we tasted the communion of the Holy Ghost. This year's Conference will be held, all well, at Oxford. Come! In the old days pilgrims wended their way to Canterbury. We will go as pilgrims to Oxford, there to taste again something, I think, of the communion which the early Christians knew, and once more to spread out our Cause before the Eternal. *If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.*

REVIEWS.

CONCERNING PRAYER.

There is more prayer than there used to be, although not necessarily in churches. The reason is obvious. Wherever there is danger, anxiety, death, there is more prayer than where there is safety, peace of mind, and prosperity. As in Byron's shipwreck, there are many praying to-day, who perhaps have never prayed before. They pray not because they are sure that prayer is effective, but because they feel it may be. It is worth trying it. It may turn a bullet from its course. It may save a friend's life. It may relieve well-nigh intolerable agony. Therefore they pray. When men are drowning they will catch at straws. It is not an act of reason but of impulse. When, however, they have leisure to reflect they must needs think about it and ask questions. Books dealing with prayer are particularly opportune at such a time. As good a book as any educated person can read on the subject has just been published. It is entitled *Concerning Prayer, its Nature, its Difficulties, and its Value.** It is a collection of fourteen essays by eleven essayists. Some of the essayists, viz., Mr. Edwyn Bevan, Canon Streeter, Rev. W. F. Lofthouse, Professor Rufus Jones, and the author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia* are well-known writers, and the other contributors, the Revs. Harold Anson, Leonard Hodgson, C. H. S. Matthews, W. Micklem, R. G. Collingwood, and Mr. A. C. Turner, although not so well known to the reader of books, are some of them quite well known as Church publicists. We should like to call attention to each of the essays, but this is impossible in our limited space.

Perhaps the three most helpful essays for thoughtful readers will be found to be "God and the World's Pain," by Canon Streeter; "Prayer as Understanding," by the Rev. Harold Anson; "Faith, Prayer, and the World's Order," by Mr. A. C. Turner. Other themes dealt with are the Eucharist, prayer and bodily health, public worship, intercessory prayer, the mystic vision, and the devil.

In Canon Streeter's essay, one of his most original thoughts is found in his view that Christianity is not only, as Harald Höffding summed up the essence of religion, "a belief in the Conservation of Value," but above all, "a belief in the Augmentation of Value," *i.e.* that whenever any good thing seems to perish, there will appear to take its place, not merely an equivalent good, but something far better. Christianity is not as Goethe called it, "the worship of sorrow." "It is the one religion which believes that evil can be conquered, that sorrow can be turned into joy, and those whose sins are as scarlet can be washed whiter than snow—all things being transmuted through and by and in the power of the Spirit of God revealed in Christ."

Mr. Anson shews the great and valuable contribution which the scientific view of the universe has made to the conception of prayer. It emphasizes the unchangeableness and trustworthiness of the Divine character. It eliminates the heathenish notions of the Divine nature being moved to answer prayer by impulse, or adulation, or bribery, or favoritism. Mr. Anson gives an interesting psychological analysis of what prayer is for the scientist.

* With an introduction by the author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*. *Published by Macmillan's. 504 pp. Price 7/6 net.*

(*a*) "He has a confident belief that there always is a rational solution of every problem of science; (*b*) he is certain that Nature will always meet research rationally undertaken, with a rational answer, so that he can count upon Nature to respond with unvarying uniformity to the accurate demonstrations of the intellect; (*c*) his desire to know Truth grows until the heat of that desire may be fitly described as an unceasing knocking at the door; (*d*) he is confident that the answer will come along the line of revelation to him of some rational law and by his co-operation with some rational process." Hence he is quite prepared for Bishop Westcott's definition of true prayer. "True prayer, the prayer which must be answered, is the personal recognition of the Divine Will."

Hence, also as Madame Guyon wrote: "The soul should not be surprised at feeling itself unable to offer up to God such petitions as it had formerly made with freedom and facility."

The weakness of the scientific view of God is that it is apt to regard Him as impersonal, and prayer and the answer to prayer not as intercourse between persons, but as a mechanical process. The scientific view needs to be combined with our Lord's revelation of God as the Father of men, as much aware of the infinitely little as of the infinitely great, and as over-ruling all in love.

Mr. Turner begins deep down, and he asks wise questions which, as Bacon has said, are half their own answers. He is no admirer of what has been called "the battery theory of prayer." He remarks that in our time there has been a great elaboration of the machinery of prayer, "a mobilisation of spiritual forces," which is paralleled only in extent and ingenuity by modern advertising methods, and indeed is sometimes closely connected with them.

Everyone who has to do with a religious organisation in its multifarious forms is the recipient of an increasing number of pamphlets requesting his prayers upon an immense variety of details, full attention to which would require that his daily devotions should be arranged with all the exactness of a business office. It would seem that there is need of some principle or rule of proportion which has been lost or forgotten. So, too, in the organisation of common prayer. "Perpetual intercessions" demand the conveyance of deputations from outlying parishes of London to St. Paul's at dead of night, in order that successive bodies of overworked people may deprive themselves of sleep while their common needs are proclaimed for twenty-four hours at a stretch. This general conversion of Mary to the principles of Martha is in itself a sign of something wrong. The wrongness lies in this. We are allowing quantity to take the place of quality, and we are divorcing prayer from work and character.

What, then, is prayer?

"Prayer is not a substitute or an addition to the machinery of the world's forces. . . . Nor yet is it a passive supplication that our ends may be accomplished 'if God wills.' Its purpose is that man may know what God wills and, if dreams are shattered, may find among the ruins some greater good," and therefore the apostolic injunction holds: "In *everything* by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God." Prayer is the inner expression of life in God, even as obedience is the outer expression of it.

Mr. Lofthouse has an interesting essay on "Prayer in the Old Testament." He emphasizes the ethical character of the prophetic teaching about prayer. Jehovah's answers to prayer are not to be won by sacrifices or by other devices. The prophet said: Jehovah's answer to your prayer depends on the righteousness of your character and the righteousness of your cause. Look to your character and your conduct if you wish your prayers to be answered. "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." Could better advice be given to the nation to-day? The Christian conception of prayer is that of the prophets of Israel, only it is further spiritualized, that is to say, the Christian morality is higher and wider, and it is upon the due exercise of this morality that answers to prayer depend, *e.g.* "Give, and it shall be given unto you."

For the Old Testament man, it seems to us, the great problem about prayer was: *Will* God answer it? For the modern man the problem is: *How can* God answer it? The modern man's attitude is that satirized in R.L.S.'s "Spaewife."

> "O, I wad like to ken—to the beggar-wife says I—
> The reason o' the cause an' the wherefore o' the why;
> Wi' mony anither riddle brings the tear into my e'e,
> *It's gey and easy spierin'*, says the beggar-wife to me."

The modern man's difficulties about prayer are mainly intellectual, and the answer that helps him has, in most cases, to be intellectual also. Nevertheless these answers can be little more than negative—they can but destroy objections to the practice of prayer. It is only the experience of prayer and of its results which will make a modern man prayerful.

H.D.A.M.

CONSCIENCE AND CHRIST.*

Canon Rashdall's name is associated with wide learning and vigorous thinking. *Conscience and Christ* adds to these recommendations that of a pointed and picturesque style. The book is eminently readable; the pitfall of what dull men call the jargon of philosophy has been avoided with success.

The subject is one of no little urgency. For, on the one hand, there is a tendency to resolve ethics into a matter of external authority.

"I was requested to give evidence before the Royal Commission which has recently been investigating the question of the Divorce Laws in England. I ventured to suggest that the question was one in which the moral consciousness had something to say. Thereupon I was severely cross-examined by eminent ecclesiastical authorities as though I were a setter forth of strange gods—and very dangerous and unorthodox gods too. The most exalted of them . . . . pressed me to say whether I did not think it a very dangerous thing to proclaim that such a question was one to be settled by the moral consciousness. Another, an acute and learned High-Church lawyer, talked as if it really were the first time he had ever heard of

* By Hastings Rashdall, D.Litt., LL.D., D.C.L., F.B.A. Duckworth, 1916. 5/-.

the moral consciousness, and as if the admission that the human mind possessed any such activity would be fraught with the gravest disaster to Church and State."

While on the other hand, among authoritarians, what our Article calls "a corrupt following of the Apostles" is noticeable; "A disposition has recently been manifested in more than one quarter to disparage the moral teaching of Jesus Christ. The supposed discovery that the teaching of Jesus consisted mainly in 'Eschatology' has led to the adoption of an almost contemptuous attitude towards His ethical teaching on the part of writers who describe that teaching as a mere 'Interimsethik' of little present value and significance; while (strange to say) the tendency has been to some extent welcomed on the part of certain theologians of quite a different school, because they discern in it a confirmation of the position that there is nothing particularly characteristic in this part of the Lord's teaching; and that it is only in the dogmatic teaching (to be found in the Epistles and in the later Creeds) that the true essence of the Christian Religion is to be discovered. They hope therefore that they have discovered in this 'eschatological' tendency of modern criticism a new weapon against the old-fashioned 'Liberal Protestantism,' which is accused of making too much of the actual teaching of Christ and too little of the doctrine about His Person and work."

The late Monsignor Benson, whose works, whatever may be thought of them in other respects, are uniquely representative of a present phase of Catholicism, proclaims this with a note of passion. "The Christ you appeal to (the Prince of Martyrs) is nothing. It is but the failure of a Man with the Divinity left out . . . . the Prince of sentimentalists, and of that evil old religion that once dared to call itself Christianity. But the Christ we worship is more than that. Have you never heard of the Wrath of the Lamb?[1]

The antithesis between conscience and authority is in itself a false one, and exists for thought, not in things. For the more the duty of following conscience is emphasised the more important it becomes that this conscience shall be correctly informed. Whewell put this admirably when he said that, while it was always wrong to act against one's conscience, it was by no means always right to act in accordance with it. On the other hand, "whatever professions may have sometimes been made to the contrary, submission to authority in matters of conduct has never been absolute." "Certainly," says Cardinal Newman, "if I am obliged to bring religion into after-dinner toasts (which, indeed does not seem quite the thing), I shall drink,— to the Pope if you please,—still, to Conscience first, and to the Pope afterwards."[2]

This final appeal to conscience is possible because of the rational nature of that faculty. Conscience is neither a sense nor an emotion, but a faculty of judgment—reason dealing with conduct; and after such sort that its decisions, like our judgments in other subject matter, are open to revision, affected by new knowledge and changed circumstances, capable of development, because not letter, but spirit and life. "The Lord is the Spirit."

[1] *The Dawn of All*, p. 186.

[2] Letter to the Duke of Norfolk, 1875, p. 66.

This *Kyrios-Pneuma-Lehre*, as Bousset calls it, is the key to Christianity.

"Belief in the continuous activity of the Holy Spirit in human hearts and human society is the necessary complement and corrective of the doctrine of an unique Revelation of God in a single Historical Personality. Only on condition that this doctrine is firmly held and duly insisted upon, can it be morally healthy . . . . to put the historical Christ in the centre of our ethical as well as of our religious life, and to make the imitation and following of Christ into the supreme concrete expression of our ethical ideal. The Christian Church has accepted and expressed this principle by making belief in the Holy Spirit and in the Holy Catholic Church into articles of its Creed side by side with belief in an historic Son of God."

The Eschatological theory has suffered both from the onesidedness of its genuine advocates, and from the at least intellectual insincerity of those who have used it against the increasing tide of scientific theology—much as Mrs. Partington used her broom against the rising sea. But it will seem to some that, if Father Tyrrell did more, Canon Rashdall does less, than justice to Schweitzer; whose theory of the Messianic secret is a permanent asset to Christology, and whose accentuation of the eschatological element in the Gospels was a not uncalled for reminder to theologians of the risk of ignoring inconvenient facts. But over-emphasis lies near emphasis; and "either—or" is rarely a real alternative. "A little of both, like most of us," says the dustman in Pygmalion. Things shade off into one another. They are seldom wholly this, or wholly that; but both, or neither, or something between the two. So that our long northern twilight is more in touch with nature than the sharp-cut tropical day and night. And Canon Rashdall argues conclusively that:

(1) "There is no real incompatibility between these two aspects of the Kingdom of God—the present, or ethical; and the future, or transcendental"; and (2) That "the ethical ideal presented to us by the teaching of Christ does still appeal to us in its essential principles as the highest that we know."

He adds, however, a timely caution:

"We shall do well to prepare ourselves for the possibility that the more advanced Eschatologists are right on the purely critical questions, or at least that some quite Christian minds may think them to be right; and to ask ourselves what we should say if it could be shewn that all the eschatological sayings were uttered and were meant in a sense not very different from that of current expectation. I should venture to ask whether even such an admission would demand more than a slight extension of that doctrine of the limited knowledge of Christ which has now, I suppose, been accepted by all serious Theologians, and by most thoughtful Christians. We have most of us come to recognize that the theory of the unique Divine Sonship of Jesus is not incompatible with the admission that He knew no more about the date and authorship of the Old Testament books, or the causation of mental disease, than other men of His time. Need our Christology be much more affected by the discovery that He also shared their conception as to the way and the time in which God would judge the world, and set up the Messianic Kingdom?"

It is too easily concluded that, because the substance of certain precepts of Christ is found in Pagan or Hebrew writers, these writers stand on His level or He on theirs. The aloofness of the "proud philosopher," never far from the Stoic, is foreign to Him: to a Jew who reminded Wellhausen that most, if not all, of His sayings were to be found in the Talmud, the great critic answered—"Yes, and much more besides." And he pointed out that it is just in the absence of this "much more" from the Gospels that the uniqueness of Jesus consists. He set at naught the tradition of the elders, he neither preached nor (it seems) practised the observance of the ritual law; it is "to Moses, not directly to God, that He refers the injunctions of the Pentateuch . . . . He seized upon the spiritual and ethical import of the Jewish Scriptures, and ignored all the rest." He deepened and spiritualized its moral requirements. "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time . . . . But I say unto you": He spoke "as one having authority, and not as the Scribes." More than any other religious teacher, He identified Religion and Morality: for Him the non-moral was also the non-religious; and "in the whole range of Theology there is no principle so important as this." And it is a principle of permanent value: "the interim for which, according to some, Christ's ethic was suited, has certainly not come to an end yet."

The objections which have been raised against the moral teaching of Christ arise partly from "the deadly literalness of the Western mind, bent either on a too literal imitation of the outward accidents of the Master's life on the one hand, or anxious to represent them as obsolete and impracticable on the other"; partly from uncritical interpretation, and partly from the forgetfulness of the principle of development—"Ye cannot bear them now." Hypercriticism is not criticism; "there is a kind of thoughtlessness which is possible in theological (or anti-theological) discussion which cultivated men are never guilty of in any other connection." The Gospel does not pretend to give us a detailed ethical code binding for all time; the notion of such a code involves a contradiction. But, if we approach it without prepossession, the principles laid down with regard to Property, Non-resistance, Marriage, Asceticism, "appeal to the moral consciousness of the present as essentially true, and as the foundation-stones of all true Morality." With Canon Rashdall's acute defence of this position not the least valuable chapters of his book are occupied. More and more, he believes, the real battleground between Christian and non-Christian civilization will turn on the question of the moral ideal.

"Of those who seriously accept the Christian idea of self-sacrifice for the common good, and whose conception of that good is not mere indulgence of the flesh, we can say that inasmuch as they are not against us, they are for us—even though they may not always follow us in theological matters. On the other hand Nietzsche's ideal of pure selfishness; the ideas of Mr. H. G. Wells in the matter of sexual relations; the exaltation of aesthetic culture above humanity and charity, to which there is at least a strong tendency in many quarters; the defence of unlimited, cruel, relentless competition which sometimes (quite illogically I venture to think) attempts to ground itself on the Darwinian survival of the fittest—I might now add

the international Immoralism of Treitschke and Bernhardi, more or less sanctioned by not a few German theologians, Roman Catholic, Liberal, and orthodox Protestant—these, and many other current moralities or immoralities, can never be 'baptized into Christ.' There is a sense in which we may justly say that the modern Christian ideal 'accepts' or 'affirms' the world, but not the world just as it stands with all its commonplace, conventional moralities and its still lower practices. There is still, and always will be, a 'world' which the Christian has yet to renounce as remorselessly as ever."

"The sociologist who proclaimed himself at once a clerical and an atheist"—so a recent apologist for Catholicism urges—"enunciated a formula which is a paradox only in appearance. "L'empirisme organisateur peut considérer la discipline d'une Eglise comme la condition *sine quâ non* d'un certain ordre, et defendre cette Eglise pour defendre cet ordre, sans s'occuper de ses dogmes."[1] This outlook is not unknown, though it is less frankly avowed, in England. It is foreign both to Christ and to Conscience; and no work dealing sincerely with either is likely to meet with favour in the quarters in which it prevails. But such utterances as that just quoted, or the noble passage in the last chapter on the Personality of Jesus (p. 276), should be a sufficient answer to the charge that knowledge connotes a weakening of sympathy and spirituality. The reverse is the case; Cordelia is the comment of experience on the belief that restraint of temper and moderation of statement indicate either a low moral standard or a cold heart. There will never be an insufficient number of teachers of religion who will minister both to the virtues and the vices of the pious; and who, because they share their ignorance and their prejudices, will do so in good faith. But there is need of those who can and will address themselves to a larger public—the Church outside the Churches—a public to which the Churches are apt to speak in an unknown tongue, but on whose understanding of and appreciation of the Gospel message vital issues depend. It is because Canon Rashdall has had in mind the needs of this larger public that *Conscience and Christ* has a more than denominational importance, and will be classed by serious readers among the "books that count." ALFRED FAWKES.

AN ORDER FOR THE BURIAL OF A CHILD.

The Priest and Clerks, meeting the corpse at the entrance of the Churchyard, and going before it, either into the Church or towards the grave, shall say:—

"I am the good Shepherd, the good Shepherd giveth his life for the sheep."—St. John x. 11.

"He shall feed his flock like a Shepherd; he shall gather the lambs with his arm and carry them in his bosom."—Is. xl. 2.

"Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of Heaven."—St. Mark x. 13.

[1] *Le Dèmon du Midi.* I. 77, Paul Bourget.

After they are come to the church or grave shall be sung or said one or other of these Psalms following:—

Psalm 23. "The Lord is my Shepherd."

Psalm 84. "O how amiable are thy dwellings."

Then shall follow the Lesson taken out of the 18th chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, verses 1 to 14 inclusive.

When they come to the grave the Priest shall say:—

Forasmuch as it has pleased Almighty God to take unto Himself the soul of this dear child here departed, we therefore commit *his* body to the ground; earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust; in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life, through our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change the body of our humiliation, that it may be like unto his glorious body, according to the mighty working whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself.

Then may be sung a hymn, and the Priest shall say:—

"I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, . . . *down to* . . . passed away."—Rev. xxi. 3, 4.

"And he shewed me . . . *down to* . . . and they shall reign for ever and ever."—Rev. xxii. 1 to 5.

Then shall the Priest say:—

Lord have mercy upon us. Christ have mercy upon us. Lord have mercy upon us. The Lord's Prayer.

The Priest:

O Almighty Father, in whose home are many mansions, we commend to thy safe and gracious keeping the spirit of this dear child. We bless and praise thy holy name for the richness of thy mercy and the perfection of thy wisdom, and we humbly beseech thee that we may be enabled so to trust thee, that we may be willing to render back to thee in faith those whom thou dost call, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Collect.

O most merciful Father, whose blessed Son didst condescend to take upon Himself our nature and to become a partaker in our afflictions, look with compassion we pray thee upon those who are now in sorrow; comfort them with the assurance of thy presence and sympathy, strengthen their faith in thy fatherly love and wisdom, and so support them with Christian hope and courage, that they may be enabled patiently to bear this present loss and confidently to look forward to Thine everlasting kingdom. Grant this, we beseech thee, O merciful Father, through Jesus Christ, our Mediator and Redeemer. Amen.

The Grace or *The Benediction.*

[This Service has been authorised for use in his Diocese by the Bishop of Assam. It is also being used in China.—Ed. *M.C.*]

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

South Essex Branch.—The third meeting of the South Essex Branch of the Churchmen's Union was held at The Chaplaincy, Hornchurch, on Saturday, July 15th, 1916, at 3-15 p.m.

The Rev. Herbert Dale, the host, was in the chair. Prayer having been offered, and the minutes of the last meeting read and confirmed, the chairman gave a stimulating address on "Some Aspects of the National Mission." He urged the members of the Churchmen's Union to attempt to play their part faithfully, if not effectually, in the great crisis that lies before us, to do something towards bringing into a living relationship with one another the four great classes represented by the High Churchman, the Low Churchman, the Broad Churchman, and the Man in the Street. Our duty (to our nation and to ourselves) is to put into this great effort heart and soul, and intellect and will.

Mr. Champion Russell, who followed, urged the need of Reform in the Church, and vigorously criticised certain Church methods, particularly its exclusiveness, and its traffic in the souls of men.

Others pleaded for more *teaching*—more definite and broader,—and the Rev. Bernard Hartley concluded the discussion, on practical lines, by giving a brief account of the Study Circles which have been formed, and the other efforts which are being made, in his district at Harold Wood.

Surrey Branch.—A meeting was held on July 25th at 8, Cheniston Gardens, Kensington, to form a Surrey branch of the Churchmen's Union. The Rev. E. Bury, 13, Daisy Lane, Hurlingham, was elected Hon. Sec. and Treasurer. It was decided to hold meetings in all parts of Surrey. A paper was read by the Rev. J. E. Symes, on "The present position of parties in the Church of England," which was followed by discussion.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE VALLEY OF DRY BONES.

To the Editor of THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

As the writer of the article entitled "The Valley of Dry Bones," in your June number, may I be permitted to express my gratitude for the kind and generous treatment accorded it at the hands of Mr. Fawkes? Some of the charges there advanced were necessarily vague, while others indicated a want rather than suggested a remedy. In one or two cases my unsatisfactory statement led to a misunderstanding of the complaint. The spirit of Mr. Fawkes' rejoinder, more widely diffused, would remove many misunderstandings, and bring a sense of reality to the relations of the Church with those who in many cases are little more than nominally her children. It would seem that the methods employed must be mistaken if nothing but indifference is the result when the clergy make an effort to be more than chaplains to the devout. Unlike the audience of Mr. Fawkes' Chinese Professor, in their case a large number of people are involved, and indifference to the subject itself is hardly possible. It may be that the clergy have so

entirely ignored the sinners in their pleasant intercourse with the saints, that the very species has become strange to them. We feel that this must be so when we hear of the pained surprise with which they admit the existence of abuses. At the London Missionary Conference a speaker told of a chaplain friend of his who wrote expressing his alarm at the prevalence of gross conversation among the troops. Surely the explanation is that the clergy have been living in a fool's paradise. Lectures from the pulpit Mr. Fawkes very naturally distrusts, but these would be no grounds for reproach if the clergy had been guiltless of that very avoidance which he deprecates. The broad teaching of Christianity requires no details to give it emphasis, but we have been almost suffered to forget it.

Difference of outlook and of opinion must no doubt always exist, but need one hold a static conception of the Church to deplore difference of teaching? The points which are ephemeral to Mr. Fawkes are vital to multitudes of his brethren, and if creed exposition is no longer allowed them they will be hard put to it to find matter for their sermons. Such a condition must inevitably lead to confusion, though it is difficult to see a remedy. Much good might be done if the clergy would realise that such dogmatic assertions as those contained in the Athanasian Creed meet no modern needs, and are as out of date to us as any other ready-made explanation of the tangle of the world. Social distinctions are no doubt necessary, though the respect paid to them, and a certain sense of inaccessibility, may be responsible for the alienation of more people than the clergy are willing to admit. As to clerical learning, of course there is no complaint against it in itself, but our excuse for disturbing it must lie in the apparent results. Many of the stalls in our cathedrals are held by men, who although of the highest attainments, are quite incapable of delivering an attractive or helpful sermon. Perhaps it is the price we pay for specialisation, and if metaphysicians and philosophers are indeed indispensable in the Church's chief places, no doubt it is inevitable. But when the *Times* correspondent sees in the verger a bar to the devotional use of cathedrals, it occurs to one that the canon-in-residence is often a not less serious obstacle.

To ordinary people the power of the Christian religion can never be separated from the person of its Founder. In spite of all conventions, His figure has become dear and sacred to thousands who are not, as the world counts it, religious at all. Whatever may be the effect of the war on the churches, there are many who hope that it will lead to a presentation of the personal Christ with fresh force and power. As Mr. Shaw has recently pointed out by placing Christ on a pedestal, his humanity has been lost sight of, and the result has too often been a figure austere and beautiful, but with little relation to the modern man.

Perhaps a greater attention to the central figure will lead to the evolution of that new religion of which Mr. Fawkes writes, and may also help to break the shackles of dogma and ordinance by which the Church of England has been for long enslaved.

R.E. ("A Layman").

*** The Editor is compelled to hold over to the next issue a large body of important correspondence on the theme of Liberal Protestantism and Catholic Modernism.